

Marshall University Marshall Digital Scholar

Theses, Dissertations and Capstones

1-1-2005

Malory's Maladies: Determining Intention and Influence through Editorial Theory in Sir Thomas Malory's Le Morte Darthur

Lisa Ann Stuchell
LStuchell@fmarion.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://mds.marshall.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Literature in English, British Isles Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Stuchell, Lisa Ann, "Malory's Maladies: Determining Intention and Influence through Editorial Theory in Sir Thomas Malory's Le Morte Darthur" (2005). *Theses, Dissertations and Capstones*. Paper 376.

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Marshall Digital Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses, Dissertations and Capstones by an authorized administrator of Marshall Digital Scholar. For more information, please contact zhangj@marshall.edu.

**Malory's Maladies: Determining Intention and Influence through
Editorial Theory in Sir Thomas Malory's *Le Morte Darthur***

Thesis submitted to
The Graduate College of
Marshall University

In partial fulfillment of the
Requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
English

By
Lisa Ann Stuchell

Dr. John Young, Committee Chair
Dr. Gwennyth Hood
Dr. Kateryna Schray

Marshall University
August 11, 2005

©

ABSTRACT:

*Malory's Maladies: Determining Intention and Influence
through Editorial Theory in Sir Thomas Malory's Le Morte Darthur*

By Lisa Ann Stuchell

By examining both William Caxton's edition and the Winchester manuscript of Malory's King Arthur tales, readers can begin to understand the editorial theory issues associated with these dissimilar texts. Questions concerning authorial intention, final intention, versions, and scholarly editing arise as scholars and readers try to negotiate which is the better version. However, each version offers advantages and disadvantages of Malory's work, culminating in the need for both versions to exist and to be studied.

*For my parents who inspire, encourage,
and love me no matter what I do.
Cheers!*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:

I would like to thank my thesis committee for their advice, encouragement, and patience: Dr. John Young, Dr. Gwennyth Hood, and Dr. Kateryna Schray. Without their brilliant minds and immense support, this thesis would not have been possible. Thanks also to Marshall's English Department faculty and staff for their kindness and helpfulness during the final weeks.

I would also like to thank my family and friends for all their support (financially and otherwise) throughout my thesis endeavor: Jennifer Cavender for being a great thesis-sitter, Jennifer Roberts for being a reluctant but dedicated editor, Jennifer Jones for making the writing process easier, and Christy Ford for rescuing me when I was drowning in a pool of confusion and indecision.

Thanks to all who held my hand and told me that it will work out somehow—it is still a mystery.

TABLE OF RUBRICS:

Abstract	-----	ii
Dedication	-----	iii
Acknowledgements	-----	iv
Table of Rubrics	-----	v
Introduction	-----	1
Book 1	-----	16
<i>Fyrst how Wyllyam Caxton fieri fecit Syr Thomas Malory's <u>Le Morte Darthur</u></i>		
Chapter 1: The Prologue		18
Chapter 2: Table of Rubrics		24
Chapter 3: The Colophon		27
Book 2	-----	30
<i>How the byrthe of the Wynchester Manvscript ChANGEDE Kyng Arthur</i>		
Chapter 1: The Manuscript Façade		31
Chapter 2: Vinaver's Perception of the Manuscript		34
Chapter 3: Uncovering the Roman War		36
Chapter 4: Finding Editorial Theory in Vinaver's Edition		40
Book 3	-----	45
<i>Yet of the Same Batayll</i>		
Chapter 1: Determining Editing Practices		47
Chapter 2: Vinaver's Victory		50
Chapter 3: The Other Versions		52
Chapter 4: Final Remarks		55
Colophon	-----	56
Works Cited	-----	57
Vita	-----	59

INTRODUCTION:

Sir Thomas Malory's *Le Morte Darthur* holds a unique position within the literary tradition of British literature—it exists as the first printed English version and one of the most detailed and well-known books documenting the life and times of King Arthur and his brave Knights of the Round Table. For centuries, William Caxton's 1485 edition of Malory's text endured as the sole surviving version of Malory's work. But, in 1934, the discovery of the Winchester manuscript showed a contrasting version of Malory's Arthurian text. This literary treasure instigated at first curiosity and then eventually criticism. Examination of both the Caxton and the Winchester versions raises the editorial theory issues of authorial intentions, final intentions, versions, and scholarly editing. By applying these concepts of editorial theory to Malory's two distinct versions of his King Arthur tales, readers can begin to assess and to understand the criticism and the interest generated from these dissimilar texts.

Tales of the legendary King Arthur prevailed throughout Europe beginning as early as the fifth century. Richard White explains in his book, *King Arthur in Legend and History*, that early evidences of Arthur provide “glimpses of what the real figure of Arthur might have been like...” (White xvi). These “glimpses” of Arthur are referenced and alluded to in Latin chronicles, saints' lives, and early Welsh tales (White xvi). As Vida D. Scudder discusses in her work concerning the sources of Malory's King Arthur, this initial period of Arthurian writing focuses on the “origins” of the tales; where the legends originated become just as important as the tales themselves. Many of the early references derive from British and Welsh historians, like Gildas and Nennius, and discuss

the British defeat over the “heathen Saxon invaders” (Scudder 3). While Gildas does not mention Arthur by name and only recounts the raids and the victory over the raiders, Nennius “contains one of the first references to Arthur” and mentions that he was “the war-leader against the invading Saxons” (White 4). This early period of writing attempts to show Arthur as a Christian king, whose stardom comes from defeating invaders and protecting his home-land.

Beginning around the twelfth century, writers supply more elements to the legends of Arthur, making the tales even more complex and interesting. Scudder refers to this period as “that of literary creation” (Scudder 3). She explains that there are three distinct writing styles or phases emerging from this imaginative work: the “pseudo-historical chronicles,” written in prose and verse, that yearn to prove historical authenticity; the “romance-poems” that demonstrate artistic liberties with the tales; and “prose romances” that occur later than the poems and are known as the sources for Malory’s work (Scudder 3-4). The most notable of the “pseudo-historical chronicles” is the Welshman Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *Historia Regum Britanniae* around 1136. Geoffrey states in *Historia* that his work is a translation from an early Welsh document, which has either been lost or never really existed in the first place.¹ Geoffrey’s work focuses on the early British kings as historical individuals, including among them King Arthur. Because of this, Geoffrey’s chronicle is recognized as “the first major contribution to the Arthurian legend, providing a complete account of Arthur’s life in Latin prose for an erudite audience” (White xvii).

¹ The existing, early Welsh works do not provide the detailed life of Arthur as King of Britain, and therefore, are not the sources Geoffrey is referring to in his *Historia*.

Since the Latin language hindered many people from reading the text (other than the well-educated and religious figures of the time), Geoffrey's *Historia* was translated into different languages to capture even more readers, including those outside of England. In France, Wace translates Geoffrey's text into French, thereby creating the "pseudo-historical" *Brut*. Wace, however, does more than just translate; he approaches the work as a writer and with "literary creation" adds to the Arthurian legend the famous Round Table (White xvii). Following Wace's direction, Layamon (or Lawman) translates the French *Brut* into the first English version of Geoffrey's work, and subsequently, the first English version of the King Arthur tales. Layamon also changes Arthur within his *Brut* by making King Arthur more like a British war-leader (White xviii). As Scudder notes, these "pseudo-historical" accounts of Arthur are "pseudo" because of the inventiveness of the writers and the translators of the period.

Writers of "romance poems" and "prose romances" also implied the act of creating within their texts. The twelfth century French poet, Chrétien de Troyes, for example, transformed Geoffrey's bellicose Arthur "into the figure familiar to readers of romance" (White xviii). Chrétien's tales focus on aspects of chivalry, love, and romance, making the tales demonstrably different from the original writers of Arthurian legends. In Chrétien's work, King Arthur is no longer the main character of the story; instead, Chrétien focuses his five romances "on the exploits of a young Arthurian knight" (White xviii). Within each "romance poem," a knight encounters obstacles, danger, and love that he must endure to show his chivalric worthiness. Chrétien's poems inspired many other writers to focus on other characters or themes, besides those stories concerning King Arthur.

The “prose romances” also incorporated the acts and the upholding of chivalry by knights in King Arthur’s court. The infamous, French prose collection known as the ‘The Vulgate Cycle’ (circa 1250) includes many tales discussing these noble knights, as well as integrating the life and death of Arthur into the collection: *The Story of Merlin*, *The Prose Lancelot*, *The Grail Quest*, *The Death of Arthur*, and *The Book of Arthur* (White xxi). *The Death of Arthur*, or *Mort Artu*, is the final part of ‘The Vulgate Cycle’ and probably the most well known. Its notoriety is established first by changing Geoffrey’s narrative of Arthur’s death by including Lancelot into the script and then by becoming “the basis for various English accounts of Arthur’s final wars, notably the stanzaic *Morte Arthur*” (White xxi). This “creative period” within Arthurian writing exemplifies the impact Arthur had on French writers and the impact French writers ultimately had upon the Arthurian tales.

While the French felt a connection to the legends of King Arthur, the British identified with these tales on a more personal and national level. English writers “tend to display Arthur in a more positive light than do their French counterparts” (White xxiii). Arthur in English works is seen as dedicated, noble, and virtuous--not the greedy, warmonger of the French Arthurian tales. Moreover, the English writers of the medieval period seem just as interested in Arthur as in the other knights. The English alliterative *Morte Arthure* (late fourteenth century) presents poetically Geoffrey’s last section of his Arthurian story, focusing on Arthur’s death and also adding Arthur’s dramatic dream of Fortune’s Wheel (White xxiv). The title of this work establishes the idea that for many English writers the Arthurian legend and tales should begin and end with stories of Arthur.

Like the alliterative *Morte Arthure*, the English stanzaic *Morte Arthur* (circa 1350) is concerned with the death of Arthur and focuses on his demise on account of Mordred's treachery. This work is a translation of *Mort Artu*, but is much shorter than its French counterpart (White 419). According to Scudder, "translation and adaptation" is the third period of Arthurian literary history and last through the fifteenth century (Scudder 4). As English writers took advantage of this innate interest in Arthur's life and death, they adapted and translated the French works into English. Scudder explains that it was "[n]ot France, the land which glorified him, but England, the land on which he shed his glory, is Arthur's natural background" (Scudder 5). English writers embraced the legendary stories of Arthur throughout Europe and molded them into their own language and customs.

Sir Thomas Malory performed this act of adapting and translating by relying on tales from 'The Vulgate Cycle,' Chrétien's tales of Arthurian knights, the alliterative *Morte Arthure*, and the stanzaic *Morte Arthur* for his work. Following with the English tradition of Arthurian writing, Malory "prefers to eulogize Arthur, although he makes Lancelot and Tristan the main heroes of substantial sections in his romance" (White 491). What Malory has done in his treatment of the Arthurian tales is to adapt the "romance poems" and "prose romances" into "a form accessible to contemporary readers" (Vinaver *Works* lix). Malory uses the English medieval spelling of words and creates an Arthurian romance embodying both the French prose writing style and the positive English perception of King Arthur.

Malory's Arthurian tales is celebrated as the best and the most complete account of the stories concerning King Arthur and his knights. His work is also regarded as the

first attempt to create an extensive piece of fictional prose. Moreover, Malory is praised by some critics for dismissing the lengthy, poetic rhetoric found in the alliterative verse and transforming the tales into a more concise, literary prose form that does not include all the rhyming schemes. The outcome of Malory's adaptation of the prior Arthurian tales combined with his own stylistic characteristics produced a work that was "artificially constructed to demonstrate concepts of sovereignty, courtesy, knight-errantry and salvation" (Whitaker 7). Thus, Malory created a King Arthur worthy of his English readers, while continuing the high standards of English medieval writers.

Skepticism, however, surrounds Malory's authorship of these tales. The name of Sir Thomas Malory comes from Caxton's prologue and the author's own colophon at the end of the work. However, there is no conclusive evidence as to which Malory is being referred to in these sections. Historically, researchers have concluded that there are three Malories that were alive at the time this work was written. One Malory of Newbold Revell is noted as a prisoner during the years the tales were completed. Vinaver seems to believe that this is the Malory that was the "knyght presoner" mentioned in the *explicit* following *The Tale of King Arthur* as seen in the Winchester MS (Malory Works 180). He was incarcerated for numerous crimes, including theft, attempted murder, extortion, and rape. It seems almost impossible for a man of such low morals to create tales envisioning a king with high moral and virtuous standards. However, Vinaver points out that during the time of the fifteenth century there was a distinction between acting moral and presenting morality: "[...] there is no real reason why a man totally unaffected by the accepted code of behavior should not have been as sensitive as Malory was to their poetic and human appeal" (Vinaver Works xxviii-xxix). This Malory may have been imprisoned

for immoral crimes, making him possibly even more capable of understanding the humanistic qualities of the King Arthur characters.

Despite the code of the Round Table and the strong urgency for chivalry, many of the knights display immoral behaviors: Lancelot commits adultery with Guinevere, Balyn performs the Dolorous Stroke, Gawain kills a fellow Round Table knight. Arthur himself is so full of rage and jealousy that he banishes Lancelot and dies at the hands of his own son. In some ways, this concept of a “knyght presoner” producing the King Arthur tales makes the authorship of the work seem romantic. If this Malory can present tales of honor and chivalry as well as tales of treachery and deceit, he must understand and have personal knowledge of corruption and redemption. This Malory, therefore, comprehends the true capacity of humanity—the good and the bad. Yet, it is still difficult to discern accurately which Malory is the author of the English Arthurian text. P. J. C. Field discusses the identity of Malory in his book *The Life and Times of Sir Thomas Malory*. Field even admits that “no direct evidence has yet been put forward to link any of them [the Malories] with the *Morte Darthur*” (Field 4). His book seems to suggest that no amount of research will provide a direct connection between one of the Malories and the work. Since there is no conclusive evidence of Malory’s true disposition or if the actual writer of these tales was really Malory, most scholarship focuses on the text itself and the two distinct versions of Malory’s King Arthur.

Controversy surrounds the texts of King Arthur, making it difficult for scholars and readers alike to determine the reliability and authorial intention of Malory’s *Le Morte Darthur*. By first examining William Caxton’s edition, it is possible to speculate his role in the creation of Malory’s text. Caxton printed this book in 1485 and took the title from

the last tale in the collection, “The Death of Arthur.” Along with this editorial decision, Caxton added a prologue, table of rubrics, and a colophon to the work. Many scholars also believe that Caxton edited Malory’s tales, compiling all the stories into one large “continuous text” (Matthews *Morte* xviii). As an editor, it seems Caxton took some liberties with Malory’s text. While the work focuses mainly on the life and trials of King Arthur and his many knights, not his death exclusively, it appears erroneous for Caxton to title the work as if it focuses just on Arthur’s death. However, Caxton may have just been following tradition, as some of Malory’s sources are also entitled the death of Arthur.

Likewise, arguments erupt concerning the exclusion of certain tales as well as the abridgment to some of Malory’s stories. John Withrington points out in his article “Caxton, Malory, and The Roman War in The *Morte Darthur*” that Caxton’s version of Malory’s work more than likely substitutes Malory’s original text. By using examples from William Matthews and R. M. Lumiansky, Withrington tries to disprove their arguments showing that Caxton had utter control over Malory’s work. Acting as a true editor and printer, Caxton would inevitably use the issue of cost and printing procedures as a reason to edit some of Malory’s original text. Furthermore, Withrington indicates that while all writers revise in some form (extracting and inserting texts at will), including Thomas Malory, “the evidence amassed to date appears to point nonetheless to Caxton himself as being responsible” for the condensed tale of the Roman War and other revisions throughout Malory’s work (Withrington 364). Caxton must first be recognized as a publisher, and as such he will ultimately make changes that he, not necessarily Malory, deems fit for the publishing of the text. Caxton’s power as both publisher and

editor automatically creates editorial theory concerns and questions, especially with the notion that he combined all the stories into one, long continuous work.

Debates arise as to whose decision it really was to produce Malory's work as it has been perceived for centuries. Did Caxton *play* with the original version of Malory's text as previously discussed? Did Malory mean "to write [...] a single unified work" (Matthews *Morte* xviii)? These questions plague both editors of Malory and editorial theorists. But, for centuries, Caxton's version of Malory's *Le Morte Darthur* existed as the sole framework for Arthurian tales, as well as for subsequent editors to utilize in their own Malory editions.

In 1934, however, a different version of Malory's King Arthur tales was discovered at the Fellows' Library of Winchester College by W. F. Oakeshott. Following his discovery, Oakeshott wrote an article identifying the major differences between Caxton's edition and this new manuscript, as well as explaining the significance of this work upon the literary world: "The evidence of this manuscript will clearly be the highest importance to any future editor of Malory..." (Oakeshott). This new version revealed eight connected tales and presented the stories as a series of smaller works. The Winchester manuscript (Winchester MS.) refuted the 1485 Caxton edition by presenting Malory's Arthur tales as separate and yet associated stories, not as one large, single piece of work. So, a new question emanates from the Winchester MS.: did Malory mean "to write a connected cycle of tales or a single, unified work" (Matthews *Morte* xviii).

Eugène Vinaver was working on a scholarly edition of Caxton's version of *Le Morte Darthur* in 1934. The Winchester MS. was brought to him, so he could use it in a future publication featuring Malory's work. With the new manuscript in hand, Vinaver

began the difficult process of determining which text was more reliable and which one exhibited Malory's original intention. He concludes in his edition *The Works of Sir Thomas Malory* that the Winchester MS. probably reflects Malory's original intention, while existing as a more comprehensive version of his work:

...while the manuscript was not that used by Caxton,
it was in many respects more complete and authentic than
Caxton's edition and had the first claim to the attention of
any future editor of Malory. (Vinaver *Works* viii)

With this proclamation, Vinaver entered into the web of controversy. His version of Malory distinctly shows that "although the manuscript is bound in one volume, it is clearly divided into several sections and each section, with the exception of the last which lacks a gathering of eight leaves at the end, is concluded by an *explicit*" (Vinaver *Works* xxxvi). According to Vinaver, Malory's use of *explicit*s at the end of each section indicates the *finis* of the tale and implies that each tale is truly separate from one another. Caxton obviously omitted these *explicit*s, desiring a text that is more fluid and controllable for his fifteenth century readers. The Winchester MS. automatically questions both the originality and textuality of Caxton's edition, while Vinaver himself extends his own scrutiny toward Caxton as an editor of the 1485 version of Malory's work.

The Caxton printing of Malory's *Le Morte Darthur* subsists as two copies: one is in the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York and the other is in the John Rylands Library in Manchester. These two copies, however, show different "state" of the texts according to Vinaver (Vinaver *Works* c). Printing procedures, being as they were during the

fifteenth century, help to explain many of these differences. Likewise, minor variants occur between some of the lines within these two works. But, these variants tend to generate many questions as to whether or not Caxton ever saw the Winchester MS. If he made changes after one printing of Malory's work, then why did he not make the necessary alterations to follow Malory's Winchester version? Either Caxton just dismissed the Winchester version completely, or he was producing his version based upon another Malory manuscript and that manuscript existed only in the above fragmented states. Vinaver tries to answer these questions through his research of both Caxton and the Winchester MS.

Vinaver's research enabled him to put together one of the first full critical edition of Malory's work. In his introduction, Vinaver expresses his own frustration over dealing with the Winchester MS.; prior to its discovery, he had spent ten years working with the Caxton version with the hopes of creating a new edition of the book. Because of this, Vinaver appeals to readers and medievalists to open their minds to this new version and to see all the possibilities the Winchester MS. offers to the literary community and Malory's work as a whole:

Instead of a 'single work' subordinate to an imaginary principle of all-embracing dramatic 'unity', what we have before us is a series of works forming a vast and varied panorama of incident and character. What their 'assemblage' may lose in harmony it gains in diversity and richness of tone, expressive of the author's real design. (Vinaver *Works* xli)

The Winchester MS. allows the reader to see beyond Malory's ability as an Arthurian writer by showcasing each tale and each character as important and evolutionary pieces of his entire work. The characters and tales seems to spin and wind their way throughout each section, exploiting Malory's use of tone and imagery, something that is missing in Caxton's version. Vinaver's investigation with both the Winchester MS. and Caxton's edition initiates many of the editorial theory issues that critics and scholars have argued over for the past seventy years.

Vinaver is quoted as saying that "textual criticism implies a mistrust of text," meaning textual critics/editorial theorists are skeptical of texts and assume works are incomplete in their printed form (Greetham 2). With this in mind, Vinaver acts like a textual critic throughout his research of the Winchester MS. As an editor, Vinaver understands the theory behind the practice of editing texts. He is interested in determining Malory's original intention or authorial intention, while maintaining the favorable reader's response to the text. D. C. Greetham explains in his article "Textual Scholarship" that "it is the business of textual scholarship to reconstruct authorial intention" (Greetham 109). Vinaver seems to follow Greetham's definition closely by examining both versions, deducing that Malory intended to have his tales in eight separate, yet connecting sections. Vinaver's edition, however, combines both the Winchester MS. and Caxton's version—supplying words, phrases, and images missing in one version—into a more complete and fluid version of Malory's text. He does preserve Malory's original intention by keeping the text in eight segments. By doing this, Vinaver eventually produces a full critical edition of Malory's work: an edition that is created by means of an "eclectic text" (Greetham 114).

As with multiple versions of a particular work, editors of “eclectic texts” or critical texts become even more involved with the process of editing. G. Thomas Tanselle explains that editors dealing with versions must “decide which of the readings to accept at each point of variation” (Tanselle 33). These decisions are based upon the editor’s judgements of the author and the text in question. Vinaver, having little knowledge of Malory’s life as a writer since the only work from Malory is *Le Morte Darthur*, relied on Caxton’s version, the Winchester MS., and even the French sources to determine what variants to use and when to use them as he created his version of *The Works of Sir Thomas Malory*. Vinaver’s edition of Malory, therefore, emerges as a “social text” (McGann 75). Vinaver tries to create a version that expresses Malory’s authorial and original intention with his work; however, he also establishes his own intention of generating a work that will include mainly the Winchester MS. as well as certain fragments of Caxton’s version. Thus, Vinaver believes he is in some way *blending* his intention with that of Malory’s, which formulates a social text. According to Jerome J. McGann, it is almost impossible for any editor to produce a work that does not display some aspects of social text characteristics; Vinaver only proves this theory with his edition.

In *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*, McGann further discusses Vinaver and his edition of Malory’s Arthurian tales in relation to the textual concept of authorial intention and versions. As discussed earlier, Vinaver’s edition proves Malory’s “authorial connection” to the Winchester MS, and consequently, a connection to his (Vinaver’s) own version of the text. Vinaver, however, never explicitly states that his version is superior to Caxton’s, but he indicates in his introduction that he feels otherwise: “The

Winchester scribes copy their text mechanically and seldom, if ever, attempt to correct it. Caxton, on the other hand, is an editor rather than a scribe” (Vinaver *Works* cix).

Vinaver humbly directs his readers to view Caxton’s version as less grounded in Malory’s true authorial intention: “the scribal text seems less corrupted than Caxton’s, and therefore will also seem closer to Malory” (McGann 82). Despite this authorial intention issue, Vinaver does not want Caxton’s text to completely disappear out of the literary canon. For five centuries, Caxton’s version influenced the understanding and the impression of Malory’s tales for both readers and critics, and consequently, this version cannot just vanish from memory or existence. Therefore, Vinaver’s edition enters the literary community as a “new version” of Malory’s text: “Vinaver’s edition enters its field, not by supplanting the Caxton text with one that is more ‘authoritative’ (least of all ‘definitive’), but by supplementing it with a new version” (McGann 83). Like all versions of texts, Vinaver’s edition needs to exist as its own work, not challenge the versions prior to it. This version becomes just as important as Caxton’s version was centuries before the Winchester manuscript was discovered.

For McGann, Vinaver’s edition holds a special place in the study of editorial theory: “[it] appeals to our longing to read texts which come as clearly and directly from the author’s hand as possible” (McGann 84). Editorial theorists desire to know that the author’s intention was upheld throughout a text. Vinaver’s edition seems to bring Malory’s intention to the literary forum, while Caxton’s seems to disregard Malory completely. But, it is difficult to presume what went on between Caxton the editor and Malory the writer five centuries ago. What we can *presume* is almost of little importance. What we *know*, however, matters more. We *know* that the Winchester MS. is essentially a

different and possibly a more accurate version of Malory's work than Caxton's edition. We *know* that Malory's text in the Winchester MS. holds a closer relationship with the author through the *explicit*s. Therefore, Vinaver's edition becomes essential in understanding Malory as a writer of Arthurian romances. Caxton's *Le Morte D'Arthur* also is an integral part of this understanding of Malory. The Caxton version has its place in the literary standard not just because of its historical permanence in British literature, but because of its significance as an alternative version to Malory's King Arthur tales. As versions, these texts show distinct differences that make each work its own entity, while constantly transforming scholarly studies in Malory, King Arthur, and editorial theory.

BOOK 1:

Fyrst how Wyllyam Caxton *fieri fecit* Syr Thomas Maleore's *Le Morte Darthur*

William Caxton began his career as a printer after almost thirty years as a merchant. He lived most of his life abroad in Bruges, Burgundy, and Cologne where he learned many languages and saw the potential for books in trade. From his close relationship with the Duchess of Burgundy, Caxton was first encouraged to translate texts and then to print them. He learned the skill of printing from Johann Veldener while he was in Cologne and brought the technology back to England in 1476 (Spisak 602). Through his high-powered connections, Caxton established his printing shop at Westminster, which operated (by his successor Wynkyn de Worde) even after his death in 1491 (Spisak 603).

Caxton's contribution to printing, especially English printing, assisted in changing the future of England: "His contribution made possible the production and distribution of uniform books in large quantities; it consequently accelerated the growth of literacy" (Bolton 171). Caxton's printing press influenced writers to write in English, providing more works in the vernacular. From this, the reading population grew to include audiences of all ages and social classes. England economically, socially, and educationally adapted and then embraced this new technology. The English language also transformed with the printing press. Printers began to establish and to unify the language to make it easier for readers: "Soon they were at work in an effort to bring some sort of standardization to the written language, so their productions would be acceptable over the whole of England and throughout the many classes of new readers" (Bolton 171). This

improved and consistent written language helped printers to sell more books and assisted in the “standardization” of the English language. Caxton may not have seen in 1476 the importance or the impact of his printing press for England, but his predecessors continued his initial work of bringing England more literature and more readers. Because of this, Caxton is celebrated for being the first English printer, just as Johannes Gutenberg is renowned for inventing the printing press.

From 1476 to 1491, Caxton printed over a hundred books, pamphlets, and other items all in the English language (Spisak 603). His knowledge of languages and his passion for literature facilitated his desire to print translations of texts, mostly French romances (Bolton 172). He also printed manuscripts of Chaucer (one in 1477 and then again in 1483) and other texts originally written in English. Malory’s tales of King Arthur corresponded to Caxton’s decision to print books initially written in English, as well as his decision to print romances concerning the chivalric tradition. *Le Morte Darthur* also ensured Caxton’s reputation as an important publisher within the history of printing.

Caxton’s 1485 edition of Malory’s King Arthur tales still exists today in two copies: the complete Pierpont Morgan Library copy and the incomplete John Rylands University print. This version includes more than just Malory’s text as Caxton added his own prologue, table of rubrics, and colophon. These addendums provide the basis for many of the accusations concerning Caxton’s position as Malory’s editor.

Chapter 1: The Prologue

In the prologue, Caxton describes the process he endured in printing this edition. He begins by explaining that “many noble and dyuers gentylmen of thys royame of Englund camen and demaunded” that he print the history of “Kyng Arthur, whyche ought moost to be remembred emonge vs Englysshemen tofore al other Crysten kynges” (Malory *Caxton’s* 1). Caxton implies here that it is his audience that desired to read the tales of the great British king, but that he also feels Arthur should and must be remembered as the best Christian king. He further reveals that before now many books concerning Arthur existed in Dutch, Italian, Spanish, and Greek. Therefore, the lack of English stories has sparked a debate as to whether he and his knights were real people. Caxton provides what he calls “euydences” (evidences) that exist throughout England of King Arthur, as well as the many stories that have survived in various languages for centuries (Malory *Caxton’s* 2). He explains there have been allusions to Arthur in Welsh works and the French writers also have discussed Arthur and his many knights, but none of these tales exist “in our maternal tongue” (Malory *Caxton* 2). He then comments on how this edition was created: “a cotype vnto me delyuerd, whyche cotype Syr Thomas Malorye dyd take oute of certeyn bookes of Frensshe and reduced it into Englysshe” (Malory *Caxton* 2). Caxton freely exposes Malory’s sources for his Arthur tales and implies the difficult work of transcribing the French stories into English. Following this, Caxton illustrates what he hopes people will gain from reading this book. Along with pleasure and enjoyment, he wants people to learn from the stories and to “take the good and honest actes in their remembraunce and to folowe the same, wherein they shalle fynde

many ioyous and plasaunt hystoryes and noble and renommed actes of humanyte, gentylness, and chyualres” (Malory *Caxton* 3). By stating this, Caxton not only encourages his readers to learn these noble lessons, but he also wants them to notice these virtues in the text. He concludes this section by praying and asking God to bless his readers.

Caxton’s next section reflects on the text itself. He explains to his readers that “to vnderstonde briefly the contente of thys volume, I haue deuyded it into XXI bookes” (Malory *Caxton* 3). He then proceeds to inform his readers the names of all twenty-one books as well as supplying the sum of all the chapters, 507. Caxton’s prologue provides insight into Malory’s text, the importance of King Arthur, and even the intended audience. However, analysis of this prologue also demonstrates many of the concerns with Caxton as editor.

Many of Caxton’s published works include prologues and epilogues; he is never weary of giving his opinion on a text. Because of this Caxton trademark, two distinct attitudes concerning his editing methods have developed over the last seventy years since the appearance of the Winchester MS. in 1934: those who believe Caxton was faithful to Malory’s work and did not tamper with his text versus those who “charge [Caxton] of editorial meddling” (Spisak 618). Focusing on the prologue, critics and scholars from both sides of the editorial argument have provided evidence defending their beliefs while refuting their opponents.

James W. Spisak (editor of *Caxton’s Malory* following the death of William Matthews), for instance, believes Caxton’s preface “reads more like a disclaimer than like the advertisement it is often taken to be,” citing that Caxton may have been originally

skeptical in printing Malory's stories because of the myths surrounding King Arthur, and therefore, Caxton provides reasons (reasons that may have convinced him to believe in the tales) why his audience should believe in Arthur (Spisak 603). Spisak also mentions that Caxton reminds his readers many times of the requests from nobles and gentlemen to publish Malory's tales, and because of this, Caxton in the end could not ignore his public duty as a printer. Completing his case, Spisak further questions the theory that Caxton ever revised Malory's work by explaining that Caxton usually explained any changes he made in a text in his prologue: "Characteristics of his own statements about what he published is that he was very candid about his procedures, as an examination of his prefaces to *The Canterbury Tales*, *Game and the Play of Chesse*, *Moral Prouerbes*, *The Historie of Iason*, and *The Golden Legend*, to name a few, will attest" (Spisak 604). But, in *Le Morte Darthur*, Caxton does not offer any remarks concerning changes he made to the text (only the addition of the table of rubrics); therefore, "his prologue does not seem to have been written by one who had a hand in composing the text, but by one who decidedly kept his hands off it—as the emphasis on his adherence to his 'cotype' indicates" (Spisak 604). Spisak's support for Caxton also coincides with the notable Malory scholar, William Matthews, whose article "Who Revised the Roman War Episode in Malory's *Morte Darthur*?" presented insight into the debate under the belief that Malory as a writer more than likely made his own changes to the text (Spisak 618). Matthews further explains that Caxton's position as printer did not give him the time or the inclination to make drastic revisions of Malory's text:

Although Caxton was a man of extraordinary energy, it is not easy to credit that, in addition to all this editing and translation,

in addition to dividing Malory's work into books and chapters and providing (no small chore) rubrics for 507 chapters as well as a prologue and a table of contents, he should have edited the whole text as his critics say he did.... (Matthews "Question" 89)

Matthews stresses here that Caxton may have wanted Malory's work to be easy for readers to understand through the divisions and the rubrics; however, with all this work to complete, Caxton did not have the capabilities to act like an editor and change major sections of text. For these scholars, Caxton assumed the role as publisher by only producing Malory's text as a "copy" of the original as his prologue explains.

Opponents against Caxton also cite the prologue as the basis for their arguments. Eugene Vinaver, editor of *The Works of Sir Thomas Malory* using the Winchester MS., notes that Caxton admits to having read and seen the Arthurian stories in French, not English, and even refers to them as "many noble volumes" (Malory *Caxton's* 2). Vinaver explains that "at no point does he [Caxton] refer to them otherwise than in the plural, and the conclusion naturally suggests itself that what he published was a collection of works, not a single composition" (Vinaver *Works* xxxvi). Yet, Caxton's edition is presented as a single piece of work refuting the argument the Caxton did not *meddle* with the text. If Malory "dyd take [his stories] oute of certeyn bookes of Frensshe and reduced in into Englysshe," then it is also possible that Caxton also "reduced" Malory's work from volumes to a singular, concise story that would appease his audience (Malory *Caxton's* 2).

However, there is another way to look at the phrase "many noble volumes" that sparks questions as to Caxton's methods as editor. While Vinaver focuses on the plural

form of the word “volumes,” it is the remark of Caxton’s, that he has looked at these French volumes, that creates suspicion. This statement seems to suggest that Caxton read the French stories prior to reading Malory’s manuscript, and therefore, he had the background necessary to understand Malory and his many sources. Yet, if Malory used sources that were contained in many volumes, it seems possible that he would have produced an English version resembling the French at least in multitude. As Vinaver explains, the French Arthurian prose cycle consisted of characters and themes that weaved in and out of the volumes without real rhyme or reason:

It was an elaborate fabric woven out of a number of themes
which alternated with one another like the threads of a tapestry:
a fabric whose growth and development had been achieved not
by a process of indiscriminate expansion, but by means of a
consistent lengthening of each thread. (Vinaver *Malory* vii).

In other words, as new tales were discovered or additions made to old ones, French writers just attached or sewed these stories onto each other, creating a confusing yet organic display of Arthurian tales. As a writer, Malory did not just “reduce” the French stories; he “endeavored to break up the complex structure of his sources and replace their slowly unfolding canvas of recurrent themes by a series of self-contained stories” (Vinaver *Malory* viii). Malory’s text consists of these “self-contained stories,” but in Caxton’s version these stories are part of one long and unified piece of work split only into books and chapters based upon Caxton’s own perception of the story. The volumes of the French seem to disappear in Caxton’s English version, creating speculation as to Malory’s original intention.

Le Morte Darthur's prologue offers insight into Caxton's publishing process, while instigating the controversy of Caxton's position as editor. For Caxton, printing Malory's work became the highlight of his career by giving the English reading/writing world the stories of King Arthur and his knights. His rationale for printing Malory's work may have derived out of pressure from the nobles or from his own desire for the English to learn of the best Christian king; either way Caxton is famous for publishing Malory's tales and for providing a commentary on its printing history. James Spisak defends Caxton by comparing this prologue to Caxton's other prefaces and implies that Caxton is providing a courtesy to his readers by explaining the publishing development of Malory's work. Vinaver, on the other hand, views Caxton's prologue as an admission to changing Malory's separate tales into a unified and extensive composition. Thus, *Le Morte Darthur's* prologue serves two purposes: Caxton introduces Malory's tales to the audience and the critique of Caxton as editor develops from these initial remarks.

Chapter 2: Table of Rubrics

Caxton's prologue ends with a catalogue of book titles and the calculation of chapters within each section. He explains to his audience why he feels this is a necessary addition: "And for to vnderstonde briefly the contente of thys volume, I haue deuyded it into XXI bookes, and eury book chapytred as hereafter shal by Goddes grace folowe" (Malory *Caxton* 3). Obviously, Caxton thinks Malory's story was too confusing for his readers and needed to be changed to help his audience understand the subject matter. Each book contains multiple chapters, totaling 506, that seem to describe what each section is about.² Readers can appreciate the usefulness of this *outline* of the text because it attempts to make it easier to find specific stories and tales. However, the large number of chapters and the many books incorporated within Caxton's edition actually causes problems for the reader.

In some respects, there are just too many books and chapters to make sense out of any of Caxton's titles. With twenty one books and 506 chapters, it is still difficult to find tales within the multi-page outline. Moreover, many of Caxton's chapter titles do not actually represent the main point or story within that section of text. Spisak even mentions that Caxton's rubric is faulty: "The table, though helpful yet to modern readers, is uneven: while most rubrics are accurate and detailed, others are too brief, and still others miss the salient point of the chapter altogether" (Spisak 613). Caxton has only provided an outline of what he considers is important within each book, making his rubric difficult to employ while reading the text. Because the rubric only appears at the

² According to Caxton, there are "V hondred and VII chapytres" (Malory *Caxton* 4). However, either "Caxton or one of his compositors skipped a number near the end of Book 1" (Spisak 612).

beginning of the text (after the prologue), it acts more like a table of contents; however, its length undermines its importance and does not serve a function once readers enter into the text. Caxton's successor, however, Wynkyn de Worde was the first to apply the rubrics throughout the printing of the 1498 edition, giving the rubrics a working purpose by introducing to the readers what is to come within each book (Spisak 613). While the books are divided and separated from each other in Caxton's edition, the chapter divisions are awkward and problematic. Caxton's chapters sometimes begin in the middle of a sentence or dialogue, making it difficult to realize when one chapter ends and another begins. He uses the paraph mark (¶) "at the beginning of each of the lombards that separate the chapters," but this symbol is also used by Caxton sometimes for dialogue and paragraphing (Spisak 614).³ Therefore, even if the paraph mark is noticed by readers, it is possible they may not even realize it is for the chapter divisions. Caxton's table of rubrics does not seem to provide a truly valuable service to the text, but it does ignite the Caxton editorial debate even more.

Even without looking at the Winchester MS., it is possible to see how Caxton manipulated Malory's text. He admits in the prologue to creating the books and chapters to make it easier to understand. But, as detailed above, these divisions do not really assist the reader. What Caxton has done, however, is to act like an editor; he has made an assessment as to how to improve upon Malory's text thereby changing the original structure. Because Caxton began printing Malory's Arthur tales fifteen years after the author's death (according to one source of authorship), he (Caxton) could adjust, add,

³ According to the OED, the term "lombard" mostly refers to "a person belonging to the Germanic people who conquered Italy in the 6th century." The definition "lombardic" mentions "a type of handwriting common in Italian MSS" from the 7th to the 13th century. Spisak's meaning of the term "lombard" must derive out of the alternate, adjective form, but it is not fully explained in his text.

remove, or do anything he felt was needed without worrying about the author's intention. The simple act of creating books and dividing the text into sections establishes one phase of the editorial theory concern with this text.

According to G. Thomas Tanselle, the editor becomes a critic and must judge for himself what to do with a text without damaging the author's intention (Tanselle 40). Malory's intention is surrounded in controversy due to the appearance of the Winchester MS., but it is evident that Malory did not have his manuscript divided into the books Caxton created. If "the author's intention in a given work is that work itself," Caxton undoubtedly ignored Malory's structure and thereby his purpose (Tanselle 39). Whether Malory structured his work as one long, "single unified work" as the Caxton version implies or as a "connected cycle of tales" as the Winchester MS. indicates, it is apparent with the table of rubrics that Caxton did re-organize and change Malory's work to fit his own objective (Matthews *Morte* xviii).

For Caxton, the table of rubrics operated as a simple system for helping readers to understand and to follow Malory's complex set of Arthurian tales. For modern readers, however, the table seems overwhelming and still too difficult to use effectively. Yet, its existence helps to define Caxton's role as a true editor of Malory's work. While Caxton manipulated Malory's text into the 21 books and 506 chapters, he fused his divisions together ultimately changing how Malory first presented his tales. These changes and manipulations demonstrate Caxton's active participation as editor, as well as provide the foundation for critics like Vinaver to expose the textual issues and discrepancies of Caxton's edition.

Chapter 3: The Colophon

At the end of Malory's account of the death of Arthur, Malory provides a brief explicit asking his readers to pray "that God sende me good delyueraunce" (Malory *Caxton's* 599). He then gives his name as "Syr Thomas Maleore, knyght" and the year he finished writing the tales, "the IX yere of the reygne of Kyng Edward the Fourth" (Malory *Caxton's* 600). This conclusion acts as Malory's signature and identifies him as the author of the text. Yet, Caxton adds his own finale to the text once again demonstrating his position as editor.

Caxton begins his colophon by announcing the ending of the tales and then supplying the name of the text: "Thus endeth thys noble and ioyous book entitled Le Morte Darthur" (Malory *Caxton's* 600). The title *Le Morte Darthur* has lasted since this printing, as most versions of Malory's Arthurian tales takes this name as well. Yet, the title stated here at the end of the book appears to indicate that Caxton provided the name for Malory's work. Vinaver argues that since Caxton provided the name based only upon Malory's last romance, *The Tale of the Death of King Arthur*, then he (Caxton) presumably acted as an editor adding or deleting things at his leisure throughout the text (Vinaver *Works* xxxix). While *making-up* a title for an author does not usually require imprisonment for the editor, in this case it does imply that Caxton took liberties with Malory's text and his intention. Caxton even remarks that the text is more than Arthur's death: "notwythstondyng it treateth of the byrth, lyf, and actes of the sayd Kyng Arthur, of his noble knyghtes of the Rounde Table [...]" (Malory *Caxton's* 600). Caxton knew the text covered more than just Arthur's death, for most of the work details the knights'

adventures and labors. Yet, it is possible that Caxton may have used this title in order to capture his audiences' attention. Another possibility of the title could be an attempt by Caxton to preserve the literary tradition of naming Arthurian works "the death of Arthur." Whatever Caxton's reason was, Vinaver views this as more than just a poor editing choice by Caxton; he feels that Caxton's remark concerning the others tales "notwithstandyng" was a way "to forestall any criticism [so] he added his famous apology" (Vinaver *Works* xxxix). To view Caxton's remark as an "apology" is to presume he made a conscious decision to name Malory's work *Le Morte Darthur*, in spite of the hundreds of pages and chapters that focus on the knights Lancelot and Tristram.

Following the title of the text, Caxton repeats the prologue by stating the author as well as his own position as printer: "Whyche book was reduced into Englysshe by Syr Thomas Malory, knight, as afore is sayd, and by me deuyded into XXI bookes, chapytred and enprynted" (Malory *Caxton's* 600). While Caxton has only mentioned the author and his role as "reducer" of the French tales into English twice, he has explained three times his act of dividing the text. Caxton expresses that his role as printer and editor is more important than Malory's position as the writer of the text. This becomes even more apparent with Caxton's signature.

Concluding the colophon, Caxton adds his signature of "Caxton me fieri fecit" (Malory *Caxton's* 600). This Latin phrase "fieri fecit" occasionally appears on medieval artworks, buildings, and coins; roughly translated, the phrase means "he arranged (it)" and sometimes is seen abbreviated as "f.f."⁴ Here, Caxton refers to himself as the

⁴ There is no conclusive evidence that the phrase "fieri fecit" has been used on other medieval printed texts or used by Caxton before or after the printing of *Le Morte Darthur*.

arranger or producer of the work. While he did arrange the text by creating divisions and produce the text by printing it, it is still possible to see this signature as Caxton's attempt to obtain Malory's glory. A tag like this usually prevents other people from adding to the work, but here it symbolizes Caxton's stamp upon Malory's text. Malory becomes just the writer and "reducer," while Caxton is the organizer and presenter of this text—something that Caxton considers more worthy as it concludes the work.

Caxton's decision to add his own colophon illustrates his position as editor, not just the printer of Malory's work. As he has explained in the prologue and shown in the table of rubrics, Caxton reiterates how he has improved Malory's manuscript. He has provided the work's title, divided the tales, and finally printed the text for his English audience. Caxton has become the maker of *Le Morte Darthur*, allowing his pride of producing the first tales of King Arthur in English to supersede Malory's writing of the tales.

BOOK 2:

How the byrthe of the Wynchester Manvscript ChANGEDe Kyng Arthur

The 1934 discovery of the Winchester manuscript instigated the debates concerning Caxton's edition, Malory's authorial intentions, and the concept of creating a full critical edition of Malory's work. For over four hundred years, Caxton's edition was reproduced, studied, analyzed, praised, and even beloved for its readable approach to the Arthurian tales and for being the first English printed version of these tales.⁵ But within a few short years, the Winchester MS. changed scholars' and critics' perceptions of Malory's work; consequently, their opinions of Caxton as a printer and editor also altered. Questions arose as to whether or not Caxton ever saw this version of Malory's text, prompting even more speculations as to Caxton's editorial choices.

⁵ During the Renaissance, however, Malory's work virtually vanished from sight. It was rediscovered in the Romantic period. Since then, Malory's Arthurian tales are considered a literary masterpiece and are bestsellers.

Chapter 1: The Manuscript Façade

The Winchester MS. differs from Caxton's edition mostly in structure, but it does include what appears to be an *unabridged* version of the Roman war tale. Because this manuscript was never printed by Caxton, there is no prologue, table of rubrics, or colophon. Actually, some parts of the manuscript are missing, which creates some difficulty in publishing this version: "The manuscript having lost a gathering of eight leaves at each end [the beginning and the conclusion] and few leaves in the middle, Caxton is our only authority for certain sections of the text including the first of the tales [...]" (Vinaver *King* xxi). Most of the textual differences between Caxton's edition and the Winchester MS. can be seen as minor variants in spelling, word choice, and sentence structure; the tales themselves are quite similar to each other and can be seen as "collateral versions of a common original" (Vinaver *Works* ciii). Yet, it is the structure and organization of the tales that causes most of the major scholarly conflicts between these two versions.

The Winchester MS. illustrates Malory's text as separate tales, divided into specific sections. While Caxton provided divisions in his edition, the Winchester MS. indicates that this text was originally segmented by the author himself. Vinaver explains that "although the manuscript is bound in one volume, it is clearly divided into sections and each section, with the exception of the last which lacks a gathering of eight leaves at the end, is concluded by an *explicit*" (Vinaver *Works* xxxvi). The sections Malory created cover the main themes of his King Arthur tales: *The Tale of King Arthur*, *The Tale of the Noble King Arthur and the Emperor Lucius*, *The Noble Tale of Sir Launcelot du Lake*,

*The Tale of Sir Gareth of Orkeney, The Book of Sir Tristram, The Tale of the Sankgreal, The Book of Sir Launcelot and Queen Guinevere, and lastly The Most Piteous Tale of the Morte Arthur and Saunz Guerdon.*⁶ While these distinct sections provide evidence for Malory's control over the Winchester MS., it is the *explicit*s that contribute and verify the conclusions to each tale.

According to Vinaver, Malory's use of *explicit*s at the end of each section indicates the *finis* of the tale and implies that each tale is truly separate. For instance, the *explicit* following the first book not only concludes the tale, but it addresses the authorship and provides a brief synopsis of what is to come in the next book:

Here endyth this tale, as the Freynshe booke seyth,
fro the maryage of kyng Uther unto kyng Arthure
that regned aftir hym and ded many batayles.

And this booke endyth whereas sir Launcelot and
sir Trystrams com to courte. Who that woll make
ony more lette hym seke other bookis of kyng Arthure
or of sir Launcelot or sir TrystraMS.; for this was drawyn
by a knyght presoner, sir Thomas Malleorré, that God
sende hym good recover. Amen.

Explicit.

As the *explicit* states, this tale regarding the formation of Arthur as King of Britain is finished. Malory then gives a preview of what is to come; he tempts his readers by even mentioning the infamous tales of Launcelot and Tristram. Yet, it is here that we first

⁶ Since the first and last sections have missing leaves, Vinaver relies on Caxton's edition as seen in the Pierpont Morgan Library manuscript to complete the works of Malory.

become introduced to the author and speculate over his life. Vinaver views the following statements by Malory as a declaration that this author was possibly a criminal and would not be able to complete his work: “In it the author bids farewell to the reader and suggests that someone else might continue his work: ‘*Who that woll make ony more lette hym seke other bookis of kynge Arthure or of sir Launcelot or sir TrystraMS.*’” (Vinaver *Works* xxxvi). Malory’s title as a “knyght presoner” and his comment “that God sende hym good recover” also implies that he was imprisoned and needed God’s good graces to escape his doom (Malory *Works* 180). Following the fourth through the seventh sections, Malory continues his prayers for help from God and even asks his readers to pray for his deliverance (Book IV). Malory’s use of *explicits* act like signatures, concluding most sections with a reminder of the author and his dire circumstances. Like Caxton’s edition, Malory has put his own “stamp” onto this manuscript; he (Malory) prefers his text as separate tales, a type of early serializing.⁷ This demonstration of finality by Malory creates anticipation in the readers, while providing an active service to the structure of the text. The Winchester MS. is not one story, but many tales connected through similar themes and characters. For Vinaver, this aspect becomes the basis for his argument against Caxton and his edition.

⁷ Serialized publishing is popular in newspapers and magazines. Novelists, such as Charles Dickens and F. Scott Fitzgerald, published their works in installments, tempting readers with one chapter at a time.

Chapter 2: Vinaver's Perception of the Manuscript

The discovery of the Winchester MS. ignited the interest in Malory and his King Arthur tales once again during the 20th century. Vinaver even abandoned his critical analysis of Caxton's edition in order to produce a scholarly edition of the Winchester MS. Vinaver's work with the Winchester MS. initiated scholars' doubts toward Caxton as editor of Malory's texts. Upon examining the Winchester MS., Vinaver was convinced that Caxton's edition lacked Malory's original intention and that Caxton altered and even manipulated Malory's work: "The most obvious merit of this text [the Winchester MS.] is that it brings us nearer to what Malory really wrote" (Vinaver *Works* viii). Vinaver's belief in the "mistrust of text" stems from this critique of Caxton as editor of the 1485 edition of Malory's work (Greetham 2).

For Vinaver, the Winchester MS. provides evidence of the changes Caxton committed. Malory desired to present his work in segments, and Caxton obviously ignored this structure by printing the version as one long, continuous story. The beauty to the Winchester MS., according to Vinaver, is that we can see Malory's ability as an artist and appreciate his writing style more:

Less obvious but no less vital is the fact that it enables us to see Malory's work in the making— [...] as a series of separate romances each representing a distinct stage in the author's development, from his first timid attempts at imaginative narrative to the consummate mastery of his last great books.
(Vinaver *Works* viii)

Vinaver sees each section as representative of Malory's writing improving and adapting. He begins his tales apprehensively, fearful of damaging the reputation of the once and future king. But as his sections advance to the finale of Arthur's demise, Malory also advances as a writer, showing great courage and ability to detail the account. The sections seem to indicate Malory's own quest to make sense of the French sources by organizing his work into concise and accessible books. Each book focuses on the most significant character or theme. Therefore, it is easier for readers to follow the stories and to see the connections between tales. For Vinaver, the Winchester MS. exemplifies Malory's genius, but not just in chronicling the Arthurian legend; Malory's organization of the tales also shows his brilliance by creating a text accessible to his English readers.

Chapter 3: Uncovering the Roman War

The Roman War episode describes King Arthur's victory over the Roman Emperor Lucius who challenges Arthur to battle. Lucius sends messengers to Arthur "commaundyng hym to pay his trewage that his auncettryes have payde before hym" (Malory *Works* 185). This angers Arthur, and he decides to take back his rightful ownership of the Roman territory. Lucius also feels threatened by Arthur's greatness and wants to destroy him. Arthur and Lucius go to battle with many of the Round Table knights agreeing to bring their own men to battle. Of course, Arthur wins the battle and kills Lucius. He returns home an emperor of Rome and a celebrated conqueror of invaders upon his kingdom.

The Winchester MS. provides a detailed account of the Roman War episode, while Caxton's edition does not. For scholars, this has become a hot topic of debate as the different versions create skepticism of Caxton's role as editor. Caxton supporters claim that Malory revised his work, especially this part, and removed some of the excess story himself. However, the Winchester MS. indicates the contrary, and for many scholars, this reduction in text provides the foundation for their argument against Caxton.

William Matthews' article "A Question of Texts" discusses the debate as seen from the perspective of a Caxton supporter. He confirms Malory's act of revision by comparing the Caxton edition to *Morte Arthure*: "Even before the discovery of W [Winchester MS.], it had long been known that Malory's account of the Roman War had been reduced from the first three-quarters of a northern alliterative poem entitled *Morte Arthure*" (Matthews "Question" 65). Malory used *Morte Arthure* as a source for the

Roman War and for much of his final sections. Matthews sees the differences between Malory's work and the poem as an obvious attempt by Malory to reduce "the ruthlessness, courage, and military motives of the earlier epic" (Matthews "Question" 67).

Matthews also points out the differences between the two versions. Caxton's edition shows many of the descriptive details and digressions removed from the text. Matthews explains that "in addition to these omissions, a good deal of wordage is saved by *précis*, paraphrase, and stylistic changes" (Matthews "Question" 77). In the scene where the knights agree to provide men for the battle, Caxton omits the descriptive reasons why the knights are eager to help Arthur and simplifies it with short sentences focusing on the amount of men being offered to fight: "And thenne euery man agreed to make warre and to ayde after their power, that is to wete, the Lord of West Walis promysed to bryng xxx.m men, and Syr Vwayne, Syr Ider, his son, with their cosyns, promysed to bryng xxx.m." (Malory *Caxton* 122). Caxton's version is obviously shorter and clearer because of these elements of simplicity and precision. Many of the other dialogue scenes in the Winchester MS. are cut in Caxton's edition, especially those dialogues between knights that occur during the battle. Thus, Matthews believes that Caxton's edition becomes a "more modern narrative style, more truly prose, plainer, and simpler" (Matthews "Question" 79). Moreover, Caxton's version seems to focus on the code of the Round Table more than on the particularities of the battles. By doing so, Caxton's edition differs from the Winchester MS.'s fuller and more detailed account of the Roman War.

The Winchester MS. presents the Roman War episode as a “self-contained narrative” (Matthews “Question” 71). Its placement among the tales changes how Arthur is viewed by the readers:

It [the Winchester MS.] also attempts to glorify the earlier years of Arthur’s reign, to move the Roman War from the narrow world of Arthurian chronicle into the wider Arthurian world of French and English romance, and to mitigate the epic qualities of the poetic source and invest the episode with traits more suited to romance. (Matthews “Question” 71)

Because the Roman War episode follows *The Tale of King Arthur*, Arthur progresses as a young king to a ruler and a warrior. This account shows him to be brave and great in defending his kingdom. The Winchester MS. also discusses more war tactics than its Caxton counterpart, explaining specific methods as to how Arthur is going to defeat Lucius. Arthur experiences the fame and glory for his war-time abilities as seen in many of the romance narratives. The Winchester MS. distinctly provides more of Arthur’s role as king and presents the Roman War episode as a factor in Arthur’s prominence.

As most of these debates show, the Roman War account alters the way Arthur is viewed as a king. The Winchester MS. wants to give this tale a place of its own and proves that everything following this story is because of Arthur’s success against Lucius. Caxton’s edition, however, demonstrates that this war was just one battle in Arthur’s distinguished career as a soldier. By examining these distinct versions, scholars can sense an intention by the author. With Caxton, it is possible to view this episode as a reason for constructing the code of the Round Table and for making the text less about war. The

Winchester MS., on the other hand, conveys the importance of victory and courage and how these elements influenced the future of Arthur's reign. The Roman War debate has developed from a question of revision to an answer of intention among these two texts.

Chapter 4: Finding Editorial Theory in Vinaver's Edition

Vinaver's approach to the Winchester MS. provides a glimpse into his own practice of editing. He clearly believes it is essential to present the material as accurately as possible, which he feels he has accomplished with his critical edition *The Works of Sir Thomas Malory*:

But, throughout my work, and in face of every doubtful passage, I have borne in mind that the proper attitude to a text should be that of an archeologist to a monument of the past: an attitude of respect for every detail that may conceivably belong to the original structure. (Vinaver ix)

Vinaver has explored, inspected, confirmed, studied, and carefully created his edition of Malory's work by examining every aspect of the Winchester MS. By proceeding like an archeologist, his goal is to maintain the "original structure" of the text for the benefit of the author and for the sake of the audience. Vinaver has succeeded in providing his readers with a "cotype" of Malory's work as seen in the Winchester MS. He preserves Malory's sections of the text because, as he explains, following Malory's structure means following his intention: "I have not, however, thought it necessary to alter the traditional sequence of the eight romances, since this sequence is confirmed by the Winchester MS. and may well represent the arrangement of the material in the author's own final copy" (Vinaver *Works* cxxv). Vinaver sees the arrangement of the Winchester MS. as Malory's original intention for his tales. He further believes the Winchester MS. has "literary

authority” over its counterpart, Caxton’s edition, through its connection to the author and Vinaver’s analysis of these opposing texts (McGann 81).

The use of colophons following each section in the Winchester MS. associates the text directly to Malory. As most of the *explicit*s mention the author and his dreadful circumstances, they also provide Malory’s voice to the text and indicate “that the Winchester text stood in a closer relation to Malory than did Caxton’s printed version” (McGann 82). This concept of a “closer relation” implies that the Winchester MS. displays Malory’s authorial intention—eight sections concluding with his personal statement, an *explicit*. Because the Winchester MS. provides a touch of Malory to the text, Malory’s intentions seem more evident; he clearly has created this text the way he wants it to be read. Vinaver feels this is true or he would not have produced his edition of Malory’s work.

Because the Winchester MS. only encountered scribes during its production, it also seems not to have endured as many or any outside influences since scribes only copy texts. Conversely, Caxton’s edition was influenced in its production first by the printer himself and then by the readers. According to McGann, literary works, especially printed texts, are “social” in design: “they do not even acquire an artistic form of being until their engagement with an audience has been determined” (McGann 44). Because Caxton was the first active audience member of Malory’s work, he was the one to determine its artistic form. His decision to alter the structure of the text by adding divisions shows his concern for his readers to understand the text. But, by doing so, Caxton has tainted Malory’s work and does not necessarily portray Malory’s intentions as the writer of the

text. Vinaver, therefore, considers Caxton's edition as less reliable than the Winchester MS.

However, authorial intention cannot be deduced just from the text itself. In *Flawed Texts and Verbal Icons*, Hershel Parker discusses his concern with deriving intention out of works and feels that "the text itself" does not even contain all the text that is necessary for understanding the author's intention in it" (Parker 226). Malory's intention, therefore, cannot be determined by just studying the Winchester MS. or Caxton's edition. What needs to occur in order to discern which text follows the intention of the author is to examine both versions critically. This requires accepting the notion that texts are social creations as authors are social beings. The textual *authority* can be disclosed through this practice by determining all factors of the work's production. Vinaver attempts to simulate this process in his introduction to *The Works of Sir Thomas Malory* as noted by McGann:

[...] Vinaver's edition shows that for an editor and textual critic the concept of authority has to be conceived in a more broadly social and cultural context. Authoritative texts are arrived at by an exhaustive reconstruction not of an author and his intentions so much as of an author and his context of work. (McGann 84)

Vinaver, having examined all existing versions of Malory's Arthurian tales, was able to conclude that the Winchester MS. embodies the qualities of an authoritative text, meaning it is the *authority* of the tales and verifies the final authorial intentions of Malory. Yet, even Vinaver cannot ignore the need or "the special authority which Caxton's editorially mediated text will always possess" (McGann 84). Without Caxton's

edition, Vinaver would not have anything to compare the Winchester MS. to nor could he have created his own edition of Malory's work. Caxton supplied Vinaver with the necessary missing leaves to complete Malory's text, as well as giving Vinaver an opportunity to produce a new version of the tales of King Arthur.

Vinaver's *The Works of Sir Thomas Malory* presents a different version of Malory's work in the formation of a scholarly edition. The first edition of this work was published in 1947, but twenty years later Vinaver produced a second edition that became the foundation for his other books: *Malory Works* (1971) and *King Arthur and His Knights: Selected Tales by Sir Thomas Malory* (1975). The 1967 edition follows the same process of analyzing the Winchester MS. and Caxton's edition, but adds more recent scholarship and interpretations of the French sources:

I have now collated the text afresh both with the Winchester MS.
and with Caxton's *Morte Darthur* [...] A version of the French
source of Malory's *Tale of King Arthur*, discovered while the first
edition was going through the press, has supplied a new basis for
editing and interpreting the work. (Vinaver *Works* v)

In this work, Vinaver has "collated" the Winchester MS., the Caxton edition, and the French sources (when applicable) into his own versioning of Malory's text. He does not actually represent the Winchester MS. in its original form, but instead creates a new text that has been weaved together much like Malory's tales. In *The Fluid Text: A Theory of Revision and Editing for Book and Screen*, John Bryant discusses the formation of texts and versions as experienced in Vinaver's works and refers to these texts as "fluid":
"Simply put, a fluid text is any literary work that exists in more than one version. It is

‘fluid’ because the versions flow from one to another” (Bryant 1). Malory’s work can be considered fluid because of the existence of multiple versions of text; Vinaver’s work, on the other hand, is fluid within itself as the versions are concurrent. Because of this fluidity, Vinaver’s edition truly becomes its own work.

Like Caxton, Vinaver adapted Malory’s manuscript (in this case, the Winchester MS.) for his own purposes; therefore, he cannot escape the editorial criticism of manipulating the text. He admits that “since we do not profess to reconstruct the original work in its entirety but merely to do the best we can with its two extant copies, the choice of our base text will imply no outright recognition of its excellence” (Vinaver *Works* cxx). Vinaver expresses his regret that his version has become a collaboration from other works and sources; yet, he continues to “reconstruct” the text as he deems necessary. He supplies paragraphing and the setting of dialogue, neither of which was seen in the Winchester MS. or Caxton’s edition. He also “divided the five longer romances—*The Tale of King Arthur*, *The Book of Sir Tristram*, *The Tale of the Sankgreal*, *The Book of Sir Launcelot and Queen Guinevere*, and *The Morte Arthur*—into sections which in most cases correspond to subdivisions indicated in the text” (Vinaver *Works* cxxvi). Thus, Vinaver also makes recommendations toward Malory’s work, and like Caxton, he splits the text into even more sections for the benefit of the readers. While he mentions that most of these subdivisions were already in place by Malory, he covertly explains that he has created some of the divisions. Vinaver, too, acts like an editor with Malory’s work. Despite his initial enthusiasm for finding a text that portrays Malory’s authorial intention, Vinaver ultimately chooses to ignore Malory’s purpose and creates a new (and possibly more complete) version of Malory’s work.

BOOK 3:

Yet of the Same Batayll

Since 1934, scholars and critics have tried to determine which version is the better text. Caxton's edition upholds the literary position as being the first written and then printed English version of the King Arthur tales. Vinaver's edition reflects a version of these tales that appears to coincide with Malory's intentions. Both texts are essentially valuable and needed in the literary canon, as they reveal two distinct versions of work. But the questions which is better, which one stays true to Malory's desires as a writer, and which one should people read are difficult to answer.

Many critics, like James W. Spisak and William Matthews, prefer Caxton's edition because it presents the tales as seen in the original sources: "the French *Merlin*, the alliterative *Morte Arthur*, and Hardyng's *Chronicle*" (Spisak 618). These critics believe that Malory truly did "reduce" the French stories into English, and Caxton faithfully printed the manuscript he received from Malory. Matthews, in particular, argues against Vinaver's edition and Vinaver's opinions of Caxton as editor: "[he] argues that Malory had a greater role than Vinaver acknowledged in organizing and unifying his work" (Kindrick xv). According to Matthews, Malory was the one who edited and revised his work, not Caxton because as a business man Caxton did not have the time or the means to do so. Moreover, Caxton's other works included prefaces that explained any and all changes and alterations he made in the editing and printing processes of those works; therefore, Caxton's only revision of Malory's text is the actual structure and

division of the work. For many critics on Matthews' side, "reestablishing Caxton's trustworthiness" has become a fundamental goal in Arthurian scholarship (Kindrick xv).

Vinaver's edition of Malory's Winchester MS. and his criticism of Caxton as editor has stimulated much support since its conception in 1947. He claims that Caxton "made changes in Malory's material that extend far beyond traditional editorial prerogative" (Kindrick xvii). Also, Vinaver argues that since the Winchester MS. is the earlier version it essentially indicates Malory's authorial intention; therefore, Caxton not only saw this version, but made the decision to change it. These views are common among Vinaver's supporters, as they blame Caxton for his "editorial meddling" with Malory's text (Spisak 18).

As both sides of the editorial battleground concerning Malory's work and Caxton's role as editor dispute each other, one aspect remains clear: both of these works are important to the study of Malory and King Arthur. The different versions of Malory's work convey different meanings to the audience. Depending on the intended audience, however, these versions can either hinder or help readers to understand the tales.

Chapter 1: Determining Editing Practices

A. S. G. Edwards' critique on editing Middle English Literature explains the process of creating a "best-text" or a full critical edition when dealing with different copies of manuscripts. As discussed earlier, variant copies of a text may institute distinct versions of that work: "Where there are multiple copies of the same text, the relation between them may be such as to give to each the status of a distinct version" (Edwards 187). Determining the "status" of texts as different versions occurs by examining each work and looking for "the survival of a unique witness" (Edwards 187). Once editors have established the existence of a "unique witness" of text, they must conclude how to deal with these multiple versions and whether or not one version is superior over the other.

"Best-text" editions depend on the decision of the editor to choose between the witnesses: "the editor selects a particular witness from the available range and bases the text on it" (Edwards 188). This selection process inevitably makes one witness the better version of the text. From here, the editor focuses his edition on the "best-text," usually providing readers with reasons for this choice. "Best-text" editions are popular among both publishers and readers. For publishers, these editions are commercially and economically more feasible: "the expense of representing the large and complex body of variant readings involved in a full critical edition is one that many publishers find unappealing" (Edwards 189). Full critical editions include the variants between the different texts and the critical analysis of each version, which creates a longer and sometimes a multi-volume work. Many publishers find these versions not as cost

effective as the “best-text” editions. Moreover, most readers find these editions more “accessible” to their needs (Edwards 189).

Audience plays a key factor in the publishing of works, especially when dealing with different versions of text.⁸ General readers may prefer texts that are not complicated with analysis, history, or commentary from the editor; they are more concerned with the story and want to enjoy their experience with the text. Scholarly readers, conversely, want to learn from the text and expect analysis, notes, and bibliographical information. For these readers, they may prefer the full critical edition of a text.

Full critical editions differ from “best-text” editions by providing variants of words and meanings, excessive notes on the work, and historical/critical analysis. The publication process of full critical editions inevitably takes longer, since “full collation of all witnesses could delay the edition for decades” (Edwards 189). The procedure for developing these editions is complicated because the goal is to present “all witnesses” in a form accessible to the audience:

After analysis of all surviving witnesses, a text is selected as a base using criteria that, like those employed in a best-text edition, include the general superiority of its readings and (probably) the appropriateness and consistency of its linguistic forms and (where appropriate) its metrical superiority. The text is then established and all substantive variants and emendations recorded in the apparatus.

(Edwards 189-190)

⁸ I am using the terms “general readers” and “scholarly readers” to simplify the types of audience publishers consider when printing texts.

Like the “best-text” edition, full critical editions begin by selecting a version to serve as the base for the work. This version is usually superior in form and structure and provides the foundation for the editor to construct his text around. Yet, with these editions, the editor includes either within the text itself or in an appendix the other textual witnesses, so the audience can understand the text in full. For many editors and scholars creating full critical editions is essential to the study of literature.

Chapter 2: Vinaver's Victory

With *The Works of Sir Thomas Malory*, Vinaver begins his edition as if he is trying to produce a “best-text” edition. He claims the Winchester MS. is the better witness to the Malory texts and builds his edition around this analysis. But, since the Winchester MS. is incomplete, Vinaver must rely on Caxton's edition to complete the tales. Vinaver then interweaves Caxton's version and some of the French sources into his own work, creating a full critical edition of three volumes in length. He supplies a long introduction (detailing the history of the tales and Malory), multiples pages of notes, and footnotes to explain variants in words and meanings. This edition, therefore, becomes an excellent example of a full critical edition of a work.

For scholars, Vinaver's *The Works of Sir Thomas Malory* provides the most complete understanding and appreciation of Malory's Arthurian tales. First, it supplies the readers with (as far as scholars can discern) Malory's original intention of the tales as eight separate stories. Readers also receive through the *explicit*s Malory's own feelings and thoughts concerning the work, which brings Malory as an author closer to his audience. Vinaver's decision to supply excerpts from Caxton and the French sources additionally provides more information for the readers; they can distinguish the variants for themselves, see the places where Malory lifted phrases and concepts from his sources, and compare these versions actively as they read the text. Moreover, Vinaver's employs Caxton's prologue, his rubrics before each section and subsection, and his chapter numbers throughout the text; these serve as a guide for readers, show the organizational distinctions between the Winchester MS. and Caxton's edition, and give Caxton

followers something they can connect to and like. In this edition, Vinaver also remains true to the Middle English language found in Malory's manuscript. All of these aspects in Vinaver's *The Works of Sir Thomas Malory* contribute to making this version a better production of Malory's tales, as well as a complete version that scholars can learn from and appreciate.

Chapter 3: The Other Versions

With the exception of about 200 years, Malory's King Arthur tales have always found an audience. Multiple versions of his work have hit the bookstores in the forms of poems (Alfred Tennyson's "Morte d'Arthur"), juvenile books (Mark Twain's *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court*), romance novels (Paul Griffiths' *The Lay of Sir Tristram*), women's interests (Marion Zimmer Bradley's *The Mists of Avalon*), and fantasy (Simon Hawke *The Wizard of Camelot*). The film industry has inundated audiences with *Excalibur*, *Monty Python's Quest for the Holy Grail*, and the recent Hollywood blockbuster *King Arthur*. Even Broadway has developed musicals focusing on this King; *Camelot* and Monty Python's spoof, *Spamelot*, are currently performed in New York City. Obviously, King Arthur tales include a large and diverse audience base.

Within literature, Malory's tales and initial versions of his work have been adapted with the audience in mind. Spisak's goal with *Caxton's Malory* is "[...] to provide an authentic text of Caxton's Malory in readable form" (Spisak 627). By producing Caxton's edition in a "readable form," Spisak has created this version for an audience not necessarily familiar with medieval texts. Publishers and editors have given control of their printing of medieval texts to the audience. McGann explains the "treatment of the text' in every edition is powerfully determined by the 'factor' of 'the intended audience'" (McGann 113). Spisak realizes who his audience will be and decides in his version of Caxton to "accommodate the modern reader without compromising authenticity" (Spisak 629). This concept of "accommodating the modern reader"

develops into the production of Malory's work containing modern structures of paragraphs and dialogues, and even modern spellings and language.

Following *The Works of Sir Thomas Malory*, Vinaver published other versions of his own version to "accommodate the modern reader." His *King Arthur & His Knights: Selected Tales by Sir Thomas Malory* does not contain all of Malory's tale or Caxton's prologue and rubrics. Vinaver created, instead of a reproduction of Malory's work, a text that is reader-friendly; he even changed Malory's original medieval language to modern English. Vinaver explains his reasons for making such awesome alterations with the text: "But as long as the form adopted exists in Malory side by side with the other and is in fact predominant, there is no great harm in preferring it and thus earning the gratitude of the lay reader" (Vinaver *King* xx). Here, Vinaver provides his excuse for changing the text based upon the belief that "there is not great harm." While editorial theorists may possibly disagree to the degree of harm he has created to the original text, Vinaver has once again created a new version of Malory's work. This version "accommodate[s] the modern reader," which seems to be Vinaver's intention. Many modern readers may fumble or become frustrated with the medieval words; modernization of Malory's text creates more and new readers, which equates to more financial gain for editors and publishers.

With the in mind, many publishers have produced modern versions of Malory's work. Some versions follow Caxton's edition by including the prologue and table of rubrics, while others simulate the Winchester MS. The printing of "coffee table books" of Malory's work have also gained popularity. These books sometimes contain artwork, detailing some of the prevalent tales and concepts to attract an audience in need of

fanciful treatments of the text. The notion of an intended audience has influenced both printers and editors to create texts that “accommodate,” assist, and encourage readers to read Malory. Thus, more versions of Malory’s work exist today for the benefit of general readers and for the emerging headaches of Malory scholars.

Chapter 4: Final Remarks

Focusing on Malory's maladies in the publishing of his work over the last five centuries has presented another editorial situation for scholars: there is no current edition, version, or text that actually reproduces Malory's work without some sort of "editorial meddling." In the many copies of Malory that exist on my bookshelf, I have yet to find one version that provides an exact duplication of his text. Spisak and Vinaver include facsimiles of the manuscripts to convey what they look like, but neither editor presents this material without some sort of modern alterations.

I am a modern reader, and like most modern readers, I prefer to read texts with paragraphs and dialogue quotation marks. But, I find that every version of Malory's *King Arthur* is structurally different from Caxton's original manuscripts and even from Malory's Winchester MS. With the technology of printing procedures, editors may believe they have improved Malory's work for the modern audience. While these improvements and adjustments have made understanding the medieval text easier, in some ways, modernizing Malory's work defeats the purpose of reading a text in the original Middle English. We have lost something in this quest for modernism and simplification; we have lost Malory's original authorial intention.

COLOPHON:

Thus endeth thys noble and ioyous thesys entytled *Malory's Maladies: Determining Intention and Influence through Editorial Theory in Sir Thomas Malory's Le Morte Darthur*, notwythstondyng it treateth of Wyllam Caxton's edytyon of Maleore's text, the Wynchester Manvscript, Eugène Vynaver's edytyon of Maleore's werk, and the fyne and eloquente dycussyon of edytoryal theorey concernyng these dyfferent versyons. Which thesys was reduced into Englisshe by Lysa Stoochell and then deuyded into III bookes, chapytred and enprynted, and fynysshed at Marshall Unyuersytey the XI day of August, the yere of Our Lord MMV.

Stoochell me fieri fecit.

WORKS CITED:

- Edwards, A. S. G. "Middle English Printing." *Scholarly Editing: Guide to Research*. Ed. D. C. Greetham. New York: MLA, 1996.
- Field, P. J. C. *The Life and Times of Sir Thomas Malory*. Rochester, NY: D. S. Brewer, 1993.
- Greetham, D. C. "Textual Scholarship." *Introduction to Scholarship in Modern Language and Literatures*. Ed. Joseph Gibaldi. New York: Modern Language Association, 1992. 103-137.
- Kindrick, Robert L. "Introduction: Caxton, Malory, and an Authentic Arthurian Text." *The Malory Debate: Essays on the Texts of Le Morte Darthur*. Eds. Bonnie Wheeler, Robert Kindrick, and Michael N. Salda. Rochester, NY: D. S. Brewer, 2000. xv-xxxii.
- "Lombard." Def. 1a. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 1933.
- "Lombardic." Def. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 1933.
- Malory, Sir Thomas. *Caxton's Malory*. 2 vols. Ed. James W. Spisak. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.
- . *King Arthur and His Knights*. Ed. Eugène Vinaver. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.
- . *Le Morte D'Arthur*. Ed. John Matthews. New York: Sterling Publishing, 2004.
- . *Malory Works*. 2nd ed. Ed. Eugène Vinaver. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- . *The Works of Sir Thomas Malory*. 2nd ed. 3 vols. Ed. Eugène Vinaver. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

- Matthews, John, ed. Introduction. *Le Morte D'Arthur*. xii-xxxii.
- Matthews, William. "A Question of Texts." *The Malory Debate: Essays on the Texts of Le Morte Darthur*. Eds. Bonnie Wheeler, Robert Kindrick, and Michael N. Salda. Rochester, NY: D. S. Brewer, 2000. 65-107.
- McGann, Jerome J. *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1992.
- Oakeshott, Walter F. "A Malory MS.: The Discovery at Winchester: Variants from the text of Caxton." *Times Literary Supplement* 25 Aug. 1934. 9 Aug. 2005 <<http://virtual.park.uga.edu/~jdmevans/public/august.html>>.
- Scudder, Vida D. *Le Morte Darthur of Sir Thomas Malory: A Study of the Book and Its Sources*. New York: Haskell House, 1965.
- Spisak, James W, ed. Introduction and Notes. Vol. 2 of *Caxton's Malory*.
- Tanselle, G. Thomas. "The Editorial Problem of Final Authorial Intention." *Textual Criticism and Scholarly Editing*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1992. 27-71.
- Whitaker, Muriel A. *Arthur's Kingdom of Adventure: The World of Malory's Morte Darthur*. Cambridge: Barnes & Noble, 1984.
- White, Richard, ed. *King Arthur in Legend and History*. New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Withrington, John. "Caxton, Malory, and The Roman War in The *Morte Darthur*." *Studies in Philology* 89.3 (1992): 350-66.
- Vinaver, Eugène, ed. Introduction. *King Arthur and His Knights*. vii-xxi.
- . Introduction. *Malory Works*. v-x.
- . Preface and Introduction. Vol. 1 of *The Works of Sir Thomas Malory*. v-cxlii.

CURRICULUM VITA:

Lisa Ann Stuchell

stuchell1@marshall.edu

EDUCATION

Marshall University Huntington, WV

Master of Arts in English (Editorial Theory), August 2005

Certificate in Medieval & Renaissance Studies, August 2005

University of South Carolina Columbia, SC

Bachelor of Arts in English, August 2001

Bachelor of Media Arts in Media Arts (Photography), August 2001

EXPERIENCE

Part-Time Instructor, English 101

Teaching Assistant, English 101 & 102

Marshall University, English Department

- * Teach and instruct students on writing processes in various modes
- * Instruct students on research techniques and citation formats
- * Encourage students to analyze and criticize professional writers/works
- * Provide students with necessary reading and writing collegiate skills
- * Plan and implement lesson plans that reflect the goals and outcomes of the English department
- * Evaluate and assign grades on students' works
- * Advise students on academic concerns/situations

Present

2003-2005

Huntington, WV

Writing Center Tutor

Marshall University, English Department

- * Advised students on how to proofread their own papers
- * Provided assistance to students at various stages of the writing process
- * Evaluated student progress during tutoring session

2003-2005

Huntington, WV

English/Writing Tutor

Midlands Technical College

- * Assisted and encouraged students in the writing process
- * Aided students with comprehension of various literary texts
- * Critiqued and edited students' assignments
- * Instructed students on the proper paper format

July 2002-July 2003

Columbia, SC

University 101 Peer Leader

University of South Carolina

- * Fostered student development through programs and activities about college life
- * Encouraged and supported the students' involvement in campus activities and community service
- * Advised students on college writing skills by examining their papers and projects
- * Developed for the students an advisement check-list and activities to broaden their cultural perspective

1999-2000

Columbia, SC

RELATED EXPERIENCE

Et Cetera, Marshall's Literary Magazine

Co-Editor-in-Chief, Editor-in-Chief

- * Create deadlines and oversee staffs' editing progress
- * Coordinate and organize fundraisers and events
- * Motivate the staff to perform in a timely manner and to exercise fair judgment
- * Act as a mediator between both professors and staff and also students and staff
- * Perform public relations duties by announcing and advertising events
- * Manage funds and business meetings
- * Aid in the presentation of the magazine online

2005, 2004

S.C.O.R.E.S.

Short Story Instructor, Argument Paper Instructor

- * Provided information on how to write in these different modes

2005, 2004

- * Created handouts and in-class work to demonstrate these writing approaches
- * Encouraged students to continue writing and to try different forms of expression

Marshall University Interview Committee

Spring 2005

Graduate Student Participant

- * Met with candidates to review their qualifications for English position(s)
- * Provided information on English department, Huntington, and Marshall Campus
- * Discussed future goals and plans of English department with candidates

Ironton High School Tutoring

Spring 2004

Sponsored by Ohio University

- * Critiqued high school students' papers by evaluating their arguments and research
- * Encouraged students to revise and proofread their work

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

The Third International Conference on the Book

September 2005

Oxford Brookes University

Oxford, UK

- * "Reviving the Oral Tradition: The Evolution of Audio Books" (Co-Presenter)

Literary Studies and Academic Inquiry: A Graduate Student Colloquium

April 2005

Marshall University

Huntington, WV

- * "King Arthur: The 'Where's Waldo' in Renaissance Drama"

19th Century Conference

March 2005

University of South Carolina

Columbia, SC

- * "The Blithedale Charade: Coverdale as the Pink Elephant"

WVACET

October 2004

West Virginia Association of College English Teachers

Cairo, WV

- * "Christianity versus Paganism: Dante's Private War in the *Inferno*"

Graduate Colloquium

April 2004

Marshall University

Huntington, WV

- * "Exposing Hawthorne's Coverdale"

CONFERENCES ATTENDED

20th Century Conference

February 2005

University of Louisville

Louisville, KY

Ohio Renaissance Conference

October 2004

University of Cincinnati

Cincinnati, OH

WEVSARA

April 2004

West Virginia Shakespeare & Renaissance Association

Huntington, WV

James Madison Conference

April 2004

James Madison University

Harrisonburg, VA

ACTIVITIES & AFFILIATIONS

- * Modern Language Association, 2003-present
- * English Graduate Association, 2005-present
- * National Alumni Association, Tau Beta Sigma, 2001-present

HONORS

Marshall University Summer Thesis Grant, Marshall University Teaching Assistant, University of South Carolina President's Honor List, University of South Carolina Dean's Honor List, South Carolina Life Scholarship Grantee, Tau Beta Sigma "Woman of the Year"

REFERENCES

Available upon request